10/783,140

-6 -

133113-2

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application and entry of the amendment are respectfully requested. Claims 1 to 26 are currently pending, and no claims have been amended.

The Office Action mailed September 15, 2005 addressed claims 1 to 26. Claims 1 to 26 were rejected.

Claims 1 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The Examiner stated that "because the specification, while being enabling for the broadly defined process as claimed". The Examiner further stated that the thermoplastic composition as written in the claim appears to be broader and open to interpretation broader than the enabling disclosure, and the claims must be specified in accordance with the disclosure at pages 3 to 6. The Examiner further stated that while stated as a preference, in view of the structures as noted on pages 5 and 6, there is no other disclosure of what other particular structures the matrix encompasses and how the structure differs from other structures wherein polycarbonate is in a mixture or blended/blocked with polysiloxane.

Applicants are unclear as to what the Examiner is saying in the rejection because it appears to state that the claims are enabled ("... the specification, while being enabling for the broadly defined process as claimed"). While Applicants submit that this is true, it appears to be inconsistent with the rejection of the claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner either clarify the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, or alternatively, reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner stated that as noted above, while stated as a preference, in view of the structures as noted on pages 5 and 6, there is no other disclosure of what other particular structures the matrix encompasses and how the structure differs from other structures wherein polycarbonate is in mixture or blended/blocked with polysiloxane.

10/783,140 -7 -

133113-2

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection. Although Applicants are unclear as to what the Examiner is saying in the previous rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants have distinctly claimed the invention. Applicants are not clear as to which structures the Examiner is referring on pages 5 and 6 and request clarification. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner either clarify the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, or alternatively, reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,676,852. The Examiner stated that the reference discloses thermoplastic compositions comprising one or more thermoplastic resins and a phosphorescent compound with an aluminate matrix. The Examiner further quoted the reference, and concluded that "in view of the above rejections, there appears to be no significant difference between the reference and that which is claimed by applicant(s). Any differences not specifically mentioned appear to be conventional. Consequently, the claimed invention cannot be deemed as novel and accordingly is unpatentable."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and submit that the claims are not anticipated by the reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference discloses thermoplastic compositions having a phosphorescent pigment with an aluminate matrix. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference does not disclose a matrix of a polycarbonate polymer in which are embedded polysiloxane domains with an average domain size between 20 and 45 nanometers, as claimed in Applicants' claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference also does not disclose a first polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a first light transmittance and a first haze and a second polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a second light transmittance and a second haze, wherein the first haze and the second haze have an absolute difference of at least about 50 and/or wherein the first light transmittance and the second light transmittance have an absolute difference of at least about 10 %; a first polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a first light

10/783,140

-8 -

133113-2

transmittance of 0 to about 55% and a first haze from about 45 to about 104 and a second polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a second light transmittance of about 55 to about 100% and a second haze of 0 to about 45 wherein the first haze does not equal the second haze and/or wherein the first light transmittance does not equal the second light transmittance; or a first polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane copolymer) having a first light transmittance and a first haze with a second polycarbonate/poly(diorganosiloxane) copolymer having a second light transmittance and a second haze, wherein the first haze is not equal to the second haze and/or the first light transmittance is not equal to the second light transmittance and the composition has a light transmittance of about 25 to about 85% and a haze less than about 104. Since the reference does not teach each and every element of Applicants' invention, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 to 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney if it is deemed that a telephone conversation will hasten prosecution of the application.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of each of the presently objected and rejected claims, claims 1 to 26. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 to 26, the claims currently pending.

Respectfully submitted:

ROBERT W. VENDERBOSCH ET AL.

GENERAL ELECTRIC CO

One Plastics Avenue Pittsfield, MA 01201

November 22, 2005

Michelle Bugbee

Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 42,370

Telephone No. (413) 448-7208